Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed May 3, 2005. No

fee is due for the addition of any new claims.

Claims 1-7 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office

Action, the Examiner allowed claims 6 and 7 rejected claims 1-4 and objected to claim 5 solely as being

dependent upon a rejected base claim. The present Response cancels claims 1-4, amends claims 5 and 6, and

adds new claims 8-13, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 5-13. Reconsideration of the

rejections is requested.

I. OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

The Examiner objected to the disclosure because "there is no summary section in the specification

disclosure." Applicants have amended the specification to include a Summary paragraph. Applicants therefore

request that the objection to the disclosure be withdrawn.

II. OBJECTION TO THE CLAIMS

The Examiner objected to claim 4 because of the following informalities: 'a semicolon (;) is missing

from the end of the limitations on line 2." Applicants request cancellation of claim 4.

III. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(E) OVER KUROIWA ET AL. (U.S. PAT. NO. 6,757,129)

Claims 1, 3 and 4

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kuroiwa.

Applicants request cancellation of claims 1, 3 and 4.

IV. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(A) OVER KUROIWA

Claim 2

The Examiner rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Kuroiwa. Applicants

request cancellation of claim 2.

V. ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 5-7

Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 6 and 7 are allowable. The Examiner objected to

claim 5 as being dependent upon a rejected based claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent

-6-

form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have amended claim 5 in accordance with the Examiner's recommendations.

## VI. ADDITIONAL CLAIMS

**Claims 8-13** 

The newly added claims are, it is submitted, allowable over the cited art.

## VII. CONCLUSION

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:	8/2/05	By:	
		Michael L. Robbins	
		Reg. No. 54,774	

FLIESLER MEYER LLP Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor San Francisco, California 94111-4156 Telephone: (415) 362-3800